

SOME  
CONSIDERATIONS  
TOUCHING  
SUCCESSION  
AND  
ALLEGIANCE.

---

---



---

L O N D O N ;

Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown  
in St. Paul's Church-Yard, MDCLXXXIX.



---

CONSIDERATIONS  
TOUCHING  
Succession and Allegiance.

---

---

LICENS'D,

April 9.  
1689.

*James Fraser.*

---



SOME  
CONSIDERATIONS  
TOUCHING  
SUCCESSION  
AND  
ALLEGIANCE.

---

---



---

L O N D O N;

Printed for Richard Chiswell, at the Rose and Crown  
in St. Paul's Church-Yard, MDCLXXXIX.

SOME

CONSIDERATIONS

SUCCESSION

ALL EGIANCE

THE

THE

THE

SOME  
CONSIDERATIONS  
TOUCHING  
Succession and Allegiance.

I. **I**T is a known Maxim, That the King cannot die, and 'tis undoubtedly true, with relation to his Politick Capacity: For the King is by Law a Body Corporate, having a Perpetuity by Succession.

Now that which makes a Degree for Succession to the Crown, is in Law called a *Demise* (*Demise du Roy*): And because ordinarily the Succession of a King commences upon the Death of his Predecessor, this word has been applied to signify the King's Death: But we know the word does not in it self signify Death, or any thing like it, but according

\*

ding to its just sense imports, a forsaking or laying down of the Regal Authority. So that the true Notion of a Demise, is, that 'tis a Separation of the Regal Authority from the Person of the King. And thus the word is used in the Law, when in pleading the Succession of a Mayor in a Corporation, they say, such one *ab Officio Majoris prædicto se dimisit & cessit; super quo* such a one (the Person succeeding) *debito modo electus, præfectus, & juratus fuit, &c.* And as a King may demise from his Government, by other ways besides Death, as by Resignation, or the like: So this word seems to be used by the Law as a general term, to comprehend all kinds of Cesser from the Government, whether by Death, or otherwise.

The Law considers the King as the Head of the Polity, and the *Primum Mobile* of Justice and Order; and has annexed to his Royal Dignity certain Powers and Functions, which cannot be separated from it, such as Protection, Government, and Administration of the Law. These complete the Idea of a King; and without them his  
Royal

Royal Dignity cannot subsist. So that the Separation of these Powers or Functions from the Person of the King, is as really and effectually a Determination of his Government, or a Demise, as a Natural Death: the Kingdom being in both Cases equally left defenceless, and without a Governour. Indeed a Cesser by Death is more absolute and final than a Cesser by any other way; because a King, whilst living, is still capable of a Reassumption of the Crown, which a dead one is not: but it is visible there is an exact Congruity between the Deposition of the Regal Authority both in the one and the other. Thus if a King resigns his Government by Instrument of Resignation, albeit he remains capable, during his Life, to re-injoy the Throne, yet, I suppose, such Resignation will be acknowledged equivalent to a Natural Death, for it is in it self a Demise, or laying down of his Government, and makes way for the next Successor as much as a natural Death.

And therefore we may conclude, That the Law which considers things as they are  
in

in their own Nature, and not barely according to their Names or general Appellations, will adjudg a Deposition of the Government, to be, what is in its own Nature, a Demise.

Moreover, if we consider the English Constitution in several Instances relating to its Government, we may be let in to discover the true Nature of the Regal Dignity in respect to its Descent. And the use that I shall make of these Instances, is only to shew, " That the Admission of  
" his present Majesty King *William* to the  
" Crown of *England* (who is Himself  
" nearly allied to the Crown) in Con-  
" junction with Her Majesty Queen *Mary*  
" His Royal Consort (who is the next  
" Heir) is very justifiable by the Law: The  
" Hereditary Course of Descent being in their  
" two Persons, at once preserved entire, in a  
" just Combinement with such a Power of  
" Election, as is consonant to the Law, and  
" consistent with the ordinary Course of  
" Heritage.

Let

Let us then take a short view of the English Policy, First in Inferiour instances, and from them ascend to the Superiour; taking it for granted, that a Constitution so well digested as ours, is all of a piece.

And here we may observe, that in all ancient Corporations, (which bear as near a Resemblance as can be, to the Body Politick of the whole Kingdom) the Mayor or Chief Officer is admitted by Election of the Members of the Corporation, and acts in Cases of Importance, by the Advice and Concurrence of a Select number of Persons, who represent the whole Corporation. And tho' this matter is for the most part managed by Election, yet in some Corporations there is wont to be observed, an Order of Succession to Office depending on Seniority, which gives some a right to succeed before Others.

Thus also in the City of *London*, which is as it were a Compendium of the whole Kingdom, there is a Mayor, Court of Aldermen, and Common Council, representing in the Commonwealth King, Lords, and Com-

B

mons.

mons. The Government of the City is vested in all these Persons. The Mayor receives his Authority by Election, and yet acts with as much Power and Grandeur, as if he came in by Commission from the King. or other Title; and tho' he subsists upon Election of the City, the Laws of the Land, and Customs of the Corporation, yet is he not for that any thing the more controulable, or liable to be deposed at the pleasure of the Citizens, upon account of having received his Authority by their means, but being once set up, is answerable for Misadministration, only according to the Laws of the Land.

The like sort of Government, or somewhat bearing a similitude thereto, there is in most other Corporations, as in Cities, Boroughs, Cathedral and Collegiate Churches, and Fraternities; and in the Inns of Court and Chancery: upon all which 'tis unnecessary to make particular Reflections,

So that 'tis manifest, Government by Election is suitable to the Genius of our Constitution, and a considerable Ingredient in it: There  
appear



appearing to be evident Prints and Characters of a mixt Government, throughout the whole Body of the Realm, distinguish'd into small Bodies or Societies. This Government receiving its Strength and Legality from Popular Consent and Election.

And as it must be supposed, that the Superior Government and the Inferiour are in some degree Conform and Homogeneous the one to the other : so we may discover in the former some Footsteps of an Election joyn'd with an Inheritance.

It is true, the Descent of the Crown of *England* has been acknowledged of a long time to be Hereditary ; and the Hereditary course has been for the most part observed, tho' not without several interruptions. Nevertheless, as it is certain, that the Government of this Realm is not wholly Monarchical, Aristocratical, or Democratical, but mixed of all three : so it is very Natural to Conclude thence, that it has also a mixture of the Properties incident to those several kinds of Regimen, and is neither Totally and Exclusively Successive, as in

Absolute Monarchies ; nor totally Elective, as in Popular States, but has something of a mixture of both those Properties : And as the Government of this Realm has more in it of Monarchy than of any other Form, so it does chiefly follow the nature of Monarchy, in point of Succession, being in general Hereditary, tho' not immutably so.

For though the King comes to his Crown by ordinary way of Inheritance, yet his Authority is wont to be confirmed by Assent of the People.

As at the Coronation of the King, the Archbishop who Crowns Him, does, according to ancient custome, before he actually performs that Solemnity, go to the four Quarters of the Rails (East, West, North, and South) that encompass the place of Coronation, and asks the People, Whether they will acknowledge the King then to be Crowned for their King, and be subject to Him (or to that effect) : setting forth at the same time His Title by Succession from his Royal Progenitors ; the Earl Marshal going before the Archbishop to each  
of

of the four Quarters, and the King turning round four times, and shewing himself to the People upon every Interrogation: And thereupon the People answer, *Yea, Yea, God save the King*; which is plainly to demand, and receive from the People, a Consent to his Investiture with the Royal Dignity.

So also the Assistance that all the Nobility, both Spiritual and Temporal are to give at the Coronation by their Presence and Attendance, as it implies a Consent, so it is a token that their Consent is esteemed of considerable weight.

The like signification have several other Ceremonies used at the Coronation, as that of Unction. Now the Custom of Anointing Kings, appears to be derived from the *Jews*, and therefore may be presumed to be used for much-what the same purposes as amongst them. And we know that Unction was never used by the *Jews*, but when the course of Descent was broken, or at least controverted; and in those cases, it was adhibited for a Confirmation of the Authority of the Person.

Person anointed. And therefore since Kings amongst us are never crowned without Uction, although they come in by regular Descent, the meaning of the Uction must be plainly this, That the Archbishop should by that Ceremony, in the name of the Church and People of England, *Deo aspirante*, confirm and ratify unto the King his Royal Sovereignty.

And to speak freely; the whole Solemnity of the Coronation appears to carry in it evident marks of Consent and Stipulation.

And though the King be King to all purposes of Government before his Coronation (for the Law wisely prefers the Substance, to wit, the Execution of the Regal Office for the good of the Commonwealth, before Matters of Ceremony and State): yet it is certain the Coronation is a Solemnity which ought to be performed in like manner as the King is of common Right bound (be it spoken with Reverence) to take the Oath appointed to be taken thereat.

If it be said, that these things are only matters of Formality and Ornament: I answer, all these Ceremonies are certainly significant of something; and as it cannot be doubted, but they were at first instituted upon just and grave Reasons; so, long Custom has made them so essential to the Solemnity of the Coronation, that they cannot be omitted any more than the Coronation it self: Otherwise it is easy to believe, that these things which look so like a making the Regality dependant on Popular Consent, had been before this time laid aside by some dark and jealous Princes.

But to pass from this Head; If the Crown of England be so absolutely Hereditary, as some give out, it might justly be wondered that the Sages of the Law should use Expressions so improper, and so contrary to the Law, (of which they cannot be supposed ignorant in so great a Case) as those we find in the Year-Book, 7 H. 7. fol. 5. b. pag. 266. Title Barre, in Margine; where Hussey arguing, speaks thus, *Le Court dit que il serra accompté lan le proch in jour apres la lienation, Come se*

le Roy murrust cest jour, & mesme le jour un  
auter est esliu, En cest case il serra puis le jour  
de cel que est mort : And in the same Book  
and Year of the said King, H. 7. fol. 6. a  
pag. 167. Title Error, in Margine ; where the  
words are, Et issint nient semble un comen Per-  
son case lou home est ullage al suyt del partie en  
action de Trespass ou dette, ou en tiel case, & le  
Roy murrust, come devant, & novel electe, &  
il est utlage sur lexicent come devant, &c. Here  
it is plain the Succession of one King to  
another, is described by the words *esliu* and  
*electe*, which import Election : So that the  
Crown of England, though it be Hereditary,  
has yet somewhat in it Elective ; the De-  
scent thereof being (indeed generally) ex-  
hibited in words that import Heritage, and  
(sometimes) in words importing Election.  
And this is the Sum of what I intended to  
evince from the foregoing Instances ; it not  
being my design to oppugn or deny its He-  
reditary Descent of it, but only to shew that  
the Descent of it is not so unalterably Here-  
ditary, but it may, agreeably to the Law,  
be dispensed with, even in a higher degree  
than is the case of his present Majesty.

And

And that the Crown is not unalterably Hereditary, will likewise farther appear, if we remember, First, that the Inheritance of the Crown, as well as other private Inheritances, is both founded upon and guided by the Laws of the Realm, of which there is no part but may be changed. And next, that the Crown may be so entailed by Statute to some Persons, as to bar and prescind the Title of others depending on Lineal Descent, whereby the ordinary course of its Descent will be altered. And we are certain, that as the Crown has actually been entailed by Statute in 4 *H. 4.* (not printed), and by Statute in 22 *H. 8. c. 2.* (extant in Print): So it has likewise by Statute in 13 *Eliz. c. 1.* been declared entailable under Penalty of Treason in those who affirm the contrary.

Indeed there is a Statute (not printed in the Statute-Books) made in the first Year of King *Edward* the Fourth, which asserts the Hereditary Descent of the Crown in relation to *Edward* the Fourth, and which declares the Succession of the *Henrys* to have been illegal and unrighteous: But the Re-



citals and Declarations in that Act are manifestly grounded on this Supposition, that *Richard* the Second was deposed and murdered by *Henry* Earl of *Darby*, who thereupon succeeded to the Crown by the Title of *Henry* the Fourth. And it is clear, so much of that Act as is recited in the Year-Book of 9 E. 4. in *Bagot's* Case, amounts to no more than a Recognition of the Right of *Edward* the Fourth, as descended from the House of *York*, in opposition to the Claims of the *Henrys*, who came from the House of *Lancaster*, without any respect to the Question we are now upon, as will appear to a diligent Peruser of that Act, both from the words of the Act it self, and from the Genealogy therein at large rehearsed. Besides, the words of that Act may very fairly be a little softned, if we consider what Allowance is to be made in that Particular, in respect of the Joy and Transport the Parliament appears to have been then under, for the Restitution of King *Edward* the Fourth, after so much Blood-shed and Desolation as the Contests of the two Houses had occasioned.

II. As



II. **A**S touching Allegiance. The true nature of it will be evident to us, by considering, That Allegiance or Ligeance with respect to the King (for anciently even Inferiour Lords had their Liege-men) imports, as the *Glossaries* tell us, That Reciprocal Tie there is between the King and the Subject, binding the one to Protection and just Government, the other to Tribute and Obedience. And these Duties of Protection and Obedience appear to be Correlative; for as the King is *Ex Officio* (as Lawyers speak) obliged to do equal Justice to all his Subjects, and to govern by Law; and the Subjects are, by implicit Obligation of the Law, bound to honour and obey the King: So the Law has appointed Reciprocal Oaths to be taken for the better enforcing the Performance of these respective Duties, that is, the Coronation Oath on the King's part, and the Oath of Ligeance on the Subjects.

And though this be the true State of Allegiance in its just Latitude, yet by Custom

this word is now most commonly used to signify the Faith and Obedience Subjects owe unto the King. Therefore taking it in this latter Sense, 'tis manifest, that as the Law is the Rule and Measure of our Allegiance, so the King is the Object of it.

Allegiance is due to the King as King, that is, as a Person vested with the Regal Authority. It is the Exercise of Royal Authority, that constitutes his Politick Capacity, and draws to it the Obedience of the Subjects, and not meerly the Descent of a Right to the Crown. For even in cases where the usual course of Succession is interrupted, Allegiance is due to the King in Possession, who is called a King *de Facto*; and for this cause Treason may be committed against Him, as well as against a King succeeding by Regular Descent: and yet by the Law, Treason cannot be committed against one that is rightful Heir to the Crown (who is for Distinction called a King *de Jure*) at such time as he is out of Possession of the Crown.

Nay,

Nay, the Law does very carefully guard the Person even of a King *de Facto* (that is, a King who does not come in by regular Succession) and requires of the Subjects Obedience to Him; insomuch, that if Treason be perpetrated against the King *de facto*, such Treason shall not only be punishable by the King *de facto* in his Life-time, but even by the King *de Jure*, after the Demise of the King *de facto*.

So also, Treason committed against a King *de facto*, shall be alledged in the Indictment, to be *contra naturalem Ligeantiam Domino Regi debitam*: For as He bears the Politick Capacity of a King, so the Law entitles Him to the Allegiance of the Subjects.

In like manner, all Judicial and Political Acts done by a King *de facto*, are as valid and obligatory as if they had been done by a rightful King in actual Possession of the Throne: whereas on the contrary, all such Acts done by a King *de Jure* who is not in Possession of the Crown, are totally void.

So

So little difference doth the Law make in case of the Regality, between a Right and a Possession.

From these and such like Instances to be met with in Law-Books, many just Inferences might be made; of which I shall now mention only a few; viz. That the Law prefers the Peace and Order of the Polity before the particular Rights even of the King himself: That the great end of the Regal Authority, and of the Law it self, is the Quiet and Prosperity of the Commonwealth: That the Succession of the Crown of *England* is not by Divine Right, but by Political Institution: That there is little or no difference between the Heir, and the Successor, to the Crown: That all the Prerogatives and Authorities of the Crown, belong to the Successor *de Facto*, and not to the Heir *de Jure*, or *ex Ordine*, being out of Possession: And, That Allegiance is payable, in such Case, to the former and not to the latter.

So

So that, since on the one Hand, the Allegiance of the People does depend on, and is inseparable from the Regal Authority and Protection; and since on the other Hand, their Majesties King *William* and Queen *Mary* are not barely King and Queen *de Facto*, but *de Jure*, by regular Descent; it may be concluded *a Fortiori* from the Premisses, that Allegiance is due to Them.

If it be said, *Non est hæres viventis*; and so no Regular Descent. I answer, *First*, This Rule relates, not to the Descent of the Crown, but to Private Estates; for the Descent of the Crown is not, nor can be ordered in all things by the same Rules as Private Patrimonies, seeing it is an Estate joyned with an Authority or Office. *2ly*, The Cesser of a King from his Government is really a Demise, and will in Law make a Degree of Descent. *3dly*, Where a King in his life time Resigns his Government, (and the same may be said in case of an Abdication,) his next Heir thereupon Succeeding may, doubtless, properly

Properly be said to Inherit, that is, to take as Heir, notwithstanding his Ancestor be still in life: For he conveys a Title to himself by Heirship; and without that, he can have no more Right to succeed than another Man.

In the next place, if we accurately consider those Precepts in Scripture which entorce Obedience to Magistracy, we may easily see that they were never designed to state and admeasure the Power of Princes, or the Obedience of the People. The Gospel-precepts of Charity, do not countermand or destroy the Laws of Property or Self-defence: so neither do the Precepts of Obedience to Superiours, the just Political Rights of Subjects; nor yet do they give either King or People, any ampler Preeminencies or Rights than they are entituled to by the Civil Constitutions: but all civil Pretensions on either side, are left to be decided merely in a Civil way.

Our Saviour himself would not undertake to adjust the Civil Rights of private Persons, by passing Sentence for the Division of a Single Inheritance; much less can he be supposed to have

have given Laws for settling the Publick Rights of Prince and People, or meting out the Power of the one, or the Obedience of the other. And as the Laws of the Land, and not the Precepts of the Gospel, are the measure of the Regal Power, and of popular Allegiance: So the Precepts of the Gospel do only operate upon those Political Duties which result from the Obligation of the Civil Laws, but do by no means create them.

If the Commands of the Gospel relating to Subjection, were to be understood absolutely and without Reserve, they may be extended to alter the very Frame of some Constitutions, and make the Power of the Prince which is by Law bounded, to become Absolute and Illimited; which certainly was far enough from being the design of our Saviour or his Apostles: For if the Subjection of the People must be unlimited and universal, the Power of the King must, of consequence, be absolute and unlimited too, or at least may be made so whenever he pleases.

D

Put



Put case that by the Laws of any Kingdom or Republick, the Governour be removeable at Pleasure, or for Male-Administation: In such case, altho deposing a Governour be contrary to Subjection to Him, yet such Deposal, being warranted by the Laws of the Place, is no breach of the Gospel-Precepts of Obedience to the Powers: Nor will the Gospel-Precepts be any just Restraint upon them from doing what their Law allows of in such Case. So that it is apparent, these Commands of the Gospel follow the Nature and Disposition of the Civil Constitution, but confer no new Rights or Powers either on King or People, beside what they have by the Civil Laws. And therefore, as these Gospel-Commands were given only as General Rules for Conservation of Publick Order, Peace, and Justice amongst Men: So they ought to be extended no farther.

But



But because some Difficulties do arise in the Minds of many People, upon construction of the Oaths of *Allegiance* and *Supremacy*, which have been of late Days generally taken, it may not be amiss to enquire briefly into their true import and Obligation.

Now the Oath of *Allegiance*, imposed first by Act of Parliament in the 3<sup>d</sup> Year of King *James* the First, and since that, by divers Statutes, appointed to be taken by all Persons in general, and particularly by all that enter into Employments of Trust, in so far as it relates to *Allegiance*, consists, of an Acknowledgment of the King's Right to his Crown and Dominions: A Denial, that the Pope by himself or by any other, has any Power to depose the King, to dispose of his Kingdoms, or to discharge his Subjects from their Obedience, &c. And a Promise, that the Party swearing, will, notwithstanding any Excommunication or Deprivation of the King by the

Pope, or his Absolving the King's Subjects from their Obedience, bear Faith and true Allegiance to his Majesty, his Heirs and Successors, and will defend Him and Them to the utmost of his Power, against all Conspiracies and Attempts, which shall be made against His or Their Person, their Crown and Dignity, by reason or colour of any such Sentence or Declaration, or otherwise.

Now to consider the Design and Words of the Oath together, is, certainly, the way to know its true meaning. The Act which first set up this Oath, is entituled, *An Act for the better discovering and repressing of Popish Recusants*: And the penning of the Oath shews, the Design of it was, and is, to secure the King of the Fidelity of Papists, notwithstanding their Obedience to the See of Rome. And from the very Words of it, we may easily perceive, that it binds Men to Allegiance, (not indefinitely, but) with a Notwithstanding

to the pretended Authority of the Pope, which is the thing designed to be guarded against by the Oath: For the Party swears, To bear Fidelity to the King, his Heirs and Successors, how? notwithstanding the Pope's Excommunication or Deprivation of Him, or Absolvment of his Subjects from their Obedience; and likewise to defend Him and Them, How? against all Conspiracies or Attempts by reason or colour of any Papal Act or Sentence: Every part of the Oath containing somewhat referring to the main Design of it, to wit, Prevention of the mischievous Effects of Popery.

This this Oath does not set up a new kind of Allegiance, but was intended to fasten the old more tightly upon a parcel of Men who had learn'd (of the Court of Rome) a way to slip the Knot. So that according to its just meaning, it does only bind the Subjects to bear Allegiance to the King, his Heirs, and Successors, in opposition to the usurped Jurisdiction and

Autho-

Authority of the See of *Rome*, claiming a Right to dispose of the Crowns of Princes, and to fix the Measures and Conditions of their Subjects Obedience: The Oath being apparently enjoyned for a particular end in reference to some sort of Men, whom it was thought necessary to lay under expresser and stricter Ties of Allegiance than those the Common Law had ordained.

As for the Oath of Supremacy, first imposed by Statute in the first Year of Queen *Elizabeth*, and since by others, it consists of three parts; an owning of the King's Supremacy in all Spiritual or Ecclesiastical Things or Causes, as well as Temporal; and that no Foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate, has any Jurisdiction, Power, Superiority, or Authority Ecclesiastical or Spiritual within this Realm: A Renunciation of all Foreign Jurisdictions, Powers, Superiorities, or Authorities; and a promise to bear Faith and true Allegiance to the King, his Heirs

Heirs and lawful Successors, and to assist and defend all Jurisdictions, Privileges, Pre-eminences, and Authorities granted or belonging to the King, his Heirs and Successors, or united and annexed to the Imperial Crown of this Realm. Now from the Act of *Elizabeth* that establisheth this Oath, which is entitled, *An Act to restore to the Crown the ancient Jurisdiction over the Estate Ecclesiastical and Spiritual, and abolishing all Foreign Powers repugnant to the same*; and from the Oath itself, three things may be plainly deduced: First, That the Oath was instituted purely for securing unto the Crown those Ecclesiastical Jurisdictions and Authorities which anciently belonged to it, but had then for a great while been usurped and exercised by the See of *Rome*. Secondly, That this is not merely an Oath of Temporal Allegiance, but of Allegiance in Ecclesiastical Matters. Thirdly, That the Promise of defending all Jurisdictions and Authorities belonging to the Crown, does likewise relate

relate purely to the Ecclesiastical Powers restored to the Crown by this Act, or afterwards to be annexed to it. And the clause of defending his Majesties Jurisdictions and Authorities being closely coupled with that of bearing Faith to Him, they cannot be supposed to import different things, but may well serve to explain one the other.

Add to this, that it appears the design of the Act was to abolish all Foreign Jurisdictions, and that this Oath was set up for the better Observation and Maintenance of the Act, as it is expressly mentioned in the 10th Section of it: So that there was no insight to make the Oath a Rule for Temporal Fidelity.

Besides, it may be observed that the Oath is penned with the same Expressions of Jurisdictions, Superiorities, Privileges, Pre-eminences, Authorities, &c. as are used in the Body of the Act, as may be seen by comparing the Oath with Section the

1st, 2d, 17th, 18th, &c. in *Rebels Statutes*: whence it is plain the Act and the Oath have both one meaning in that particular; and that if the Act means only Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, &c. (as tis manifest it does) the Oath can mean nothing else.

It is true, the Sacredness of an Oath makes it a strong Tie upon us: but the intent thereof is to bind, not to entangle us. If the Construction of Oaths, especially long ones, be not restrained to the word and plain intent of them, there will be no end of doubt and scruple in the Minds of tender People.

In short; If we consider the true nature of Allegiance, with respect to the Laws of the Land, the Commands of the Gospel, and the Oaths of *Allegiance* and *Supremacy*; The late King's Excussion of his Regal Authority, and the Judgment of the whole Body of the Realm thereupon; The Character their present

E Maje-



Majesties bear in this Government, and the Obligation to Obedience unto Them we are now by the Law under: we may clearly discern, That our Allegiance to the late King is wholly determined, and that it ought now to be paid to their present Majesties, with all the Chearfulness and Fidelity that becomes Loyal Subjects, who have a due regard to the Laws, Religion, Peace, and Welfare of their Country.

**FINIS.**

In short, If we consider the true nature of Allegiance, with respect to the Laws of the Land, the Commands of the Gospel, and the Oaths of Allegiance and Obedience; The late King's Execution of his Regal Authority, and the Judgment of the whole Body of the Realm thereupon; The Character their present Majesties

*Books*



## Books lately Printed for Richard Chiswell.

- D**R. GILBERT BURNET's History of the Reformation of the Church of England, in 2 Volumes in Folio.
- His Abridgment of the said History of the Reformation.
- History of the Rights of Princes, in disposing of Ecclesiastical Benefices, and Church Lands, 120.
- Life of Dr. William Bedell Bishop of Kilmore in Ireland, to which are annexed the Letters betwixt him and Wadsworth, about Religion. 80.
- His two Letters written upon the Discovery of the Popish Plot, together with a Collection of several other Tracts and Discourses: Written by him betwixt the Years 1678, and 1685. To which is added a Letter written to Dr. Burnet, giving an Account of Cardinal *Pap's* Secret Powers. The History of the Powder-Treason, with a Vindication of the Proceedings thereupon. An Impartial Consideration of the five Jesuits dying Speeches, who were executed for the Popish Plot, 1679.
- His Account of the Life and Death of the Earl of Rochester.
- A Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England: In which is demonstrated, that all the Essentials of Ordination, according to the Practice of the Primitive and Greek Churches are still retained in the Church.
- Reflections on the Relation of the English Reformation lately printed at Oxford, in two Parts. 40.
- Animadversions on the Reflections upon Dr. BURNET's Travels. 80.
- Reflections on a Paper, intitled his Majesty's Reasons for withdrawing himself from Rochester.
- An Enquiry into the present State of Affairs, and in particular, Whether we owe Allegiance to the King in these Circumstances? And whether we are bound to treat with Him, and call Him back or no?
- A Sermon Preached in St. James's Chapel before the Prince of Orange, 23d Decemb. 1688.
- A Sermon Preached before the House of Commons, January 28, 1688. being the Thanksgiving Day for the Deliverance of this Kingdom from Popery and Arbitrary Power.
- His Eighteen Papers relating to the Affairs of Church and State, during the Reign of King James the Second: Seventeen whereof were written in Holland, and first Printed there; the other at Exeter, soon after the Prince of Orange's landing in England.
- A Letter to Mr. Threllet. Containing a Censure of Mr. Le Grand's History of King Henry the Eighth's Divorce. To which is added, a Censure of Mr. de Meaux's History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches. Together with some further Reflections on Mr. Le Grand. 1687.
- Dr. PATRICK's Parable of the Pilgrim. The sixth Edition corrected.
- A Private Prayer to be used in difficult Times. 80.
- Exposition of the Ten Commandments. 80.
- His Sermon before the Prince of Orange, 20. January 1688.
- His Sermon before the Queen at Whitehall, March 1. 1688.
- The Pillar and Ground of Truth: A Treatise shewing that the Roman Church falsely claims to be that Church, and the Pillar of that Truth mentioned by St. Paul in his first Epistle to Timothy Chap. 3. ver. 15.

## Books lately Printed for Richard Childwell.

- His Sermon preached on St. Peter's Day, published with Enlargements.
- His Sermon preached at St. Pauls Church Garden, on the first Sunday in Lent, being a second Part of a Sermon preached before the Prince of Orange, newly published.
- Preparation for Death, being a Letter sent to a young Gentlewoman in France in a Distemper of which she died: By WILLIAM WAKE, M. A. Preacher to the Honourable Society of Grays-Inn.
- His two Discourses of Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead.
- His Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, in the several Articles proposed by the late BISHOP of COMPTON, in his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church.
- His Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, against the Exceptions of Monsieur de Mauv, late Bishop of Condom, and his Vindicator.
- A Second Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England, against the new Exceptions of Monsieur de Mauv, late Bishop of Condom, and his Vindicator. THE FIRST PART; in which the Account that has been given of the Bishop of Mauv's Exposition, is fully vindicated; the Distinction of Old and New Popery Historically asserted, and the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, in point of Image-Worship, more particularly considered.
- Second Defence of the Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of England against Monsieur de Mauv and his Vindicator; the SECOND PART.
- A Continuation of the State of the Controversie between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, being a full account of the Books that have been of late written on both sides.
- An Historical Treatise of Transubstantiation. Written by an Author of the Communion of the Church of Rome; rendered into English by William Wake, M. A. With a Preface.

## Books lately published.

- A Letter written by a Clergy-Man to his Neighbour concerning the present circumstances of the Kingdom, and the Allegiance that is due to the King and Queen.
- The Case of Allegiance in our present Circumstances considered, in a Letter from a Minister in the City to a Minister in the Country.
- A Sermon preached at Fulham, in the Chappel of the Palace upon Easter-Day 1689, at the Consecration of the Right Reverend Father in God Gilbert Lord Bishop of Sarum: By Anthony Horneck, D. D.
- The Judgments of God upon the Roman Catholic Church, from its first rigid Laws for universal Conformity to it, unto its last End. With a prospect of these near approaching Revolutions, viz. The Revival of the Protestant Profession in an Eminent Kingdom, where it was totally suppressed. The last End of all Turkish Hostilities. The general Mortification of the Power of the Roman Church in all parts of its Dominions. In Explication of the Trumpets and Vials of the Apocalypse, upon Principles generally acknowledged by Protestant Interpreters. By Druet Crispien, U. D.
- A Breviate of the State of Scotland in its Government, Supream Courts, Officers of State, Inferiour Officers, Offices and Inferiour Courts, Districts, Jurisdictions, Burroughs Royal, and Free Corporations. Fol.

